arXiv:1603.05373v2 [q-fin.RM] 8 May 2016

Sharp convex bounds on the aggregate sums–An alternative proof

Chuancun Yin Dan Zhu

School of Statistics, Qufu Normal University

Shandong 273165, China

e-mail: ccyin@mail.qfnu.edu.cn

May 10, 2016

ABSTRACT It is well known that a random vector with given marginal distributions is comonotonic if and only if it has the largest sum with respect to the convex order [Kaas, Dhaene, Vyncke, Goovaerts, Denuit (2002), A simple geometric proof that comonotonic risks have the convex-largest sum, ASTIN Bulletin 32, 71-80. Cheung (2010), Characterizing a comonotonic random vector by the distribution of the sum of its components, Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 47(2), 130-136] and that a random vector with given marginal distributions is mutually exclusive if and only if it has the minimal convex sum [Cheung and Lo (2014), Characterizing mutual exclusivity as the strongest negative multivariate dependence structure, Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 55, 180-190]. In this note, we give a new proof of these two results using the theories of distortion risk measure and expected utility.

Keywords: Comonotonicity; Convex order; Distortion risk measure; Mutual exclusivity; Stop-loss order

1 Introduction

After years of efforts made by researchers, the study of sharp convex bounds on the sum of random variables (also known as aggregate sums) with given marginal distributions but unknown dependence structure has achieved a lot of significant results. Mathematically, given an arbitrary Fréchet space $\mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$ of all random vectors having $F_1, \cdots, F_n$ as marginal distributions, the aim is to find two random vectors $(X_1^m, \cdots, X_n^m)$ and $(X_1^M, \cdots, X_n^M)$ belonging to $\mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^m \leq_{cx} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \leq_{cx} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^M$$

for any $(X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$, where $\leq_{cx}$ denotes the convex order. By definition, for a pair of random variables X and Y, we say that X is less that Y in the sense of convex order, denoted as $X \leq_{cx} Y$, if $Ef(X) \leq Ef(Y)$ for every convex function f, provided that expectations $Ef(X)$ and $Ef(Y)$ exist. In actuarial science, it is common to define convex order by using a stop-loss transform: $X \leq_{cx} Y \Leftrightarrow EX = EY$ and $X \leq_{sl} Y$. Here X is said to precede Y in the stop-loss order sense, notation $X \leq_{sl} Y$, if and only if X has lower stop-loss premiums than Y:

$$E(X-d)_+ \leq E(Y-d)_+, \ \ -\infty < d < \infty.$$

A summary of other characterizations and properties of convex order can be found e.g. in Denuit et al. (2005), Shaked and Shanthikumar (2007).

Comonotonicity plays a crucial role in determining convex upper bound on aggregate sum. Let us recall the definition. For any $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$, $\mathbf{X}$ is said to be comonotonic if

$$F_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{1 \leq k \leq n} F_k(x_k), \ \forall \ \mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Equivalently, $\mathbf{X}$ is comonotonic if and only if $\mathbf{X} \stackrel{d}{=} (F_1^{-1}(U), \cdots, F_n^{-1}(U))$, where U is a random variable uniformly distributed on the interval $[0,1]$, denoted as $U \sim U[0,1]$. The concept of comonotonicity was introduced by Yaari (1987) and Schmeidler (1986). For more details and other characterizations about the concept of comonotonicity and its applications in actuarial science and finance, we refer to the overview papers by Dhaene et al.(2002a, 2002b) and more recently in Deelstra et al. (2010). Let S be the sum $X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ and S^c be the comonotonic sum $X_1^c + \cdots + X_n^c$, where $(X_1^c, \cdots, X_n^c)$ is the comonotonic counterpart of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \cdots, X_n)$. A well-known result between the sums S

and S^c says that $S \leq_{cx} S^c$. Proofs of this fundamental result in the bivariate case can be found in Dhaene and Goovaerts (1996, 1997). Müller (1997) extended the result to higher dimensions as a special case of the concept of supermodular ordering. A simple geometric argument is given in Kaas et al. (2002) and Cheung (2010a) provided a new proof using the theory of majorization. The converse remains valid under the assumption that all marginal distribution functions are continuous and that the underlying probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ is atomless; see Cheung (2008). This continuity assumption on the marginals was removed by Cheung (2010b). A new and simple proof without the assumption that the underlying probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ is atomless was given by Mao and Hu (2011). To summarize above results we arrive at the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *If* $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$*, then* $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ *is comonotonic if, and only if*

$$X_1 + \cdots + X_n \leq_{cx} X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^* \text{ for all } (X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n).$$

Now we focus on the lower convex bound of $\mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$. When $n = 2$, the minimum sharp bound is obtained by the counter-monotonic scenario:

$$F_1^{-1}(U) + F_2^{-1}(1-U) \leq_{cx} X_1 + X_2 \text{ for any } (X_1, X_2) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, F_2),$$

where U is a random variable uniformly distributed on the interval $[0, 1]$; see, for example, Denuit et al. (2005, p. 290). Moreover, Cheung and Lo (2013a) shows that the converse remains valid. However, the sharp lower convex bound for $n \geq 3$ is missing in the literature due to the fact that counter-monotonicity cannot be generalized to $n \geq 3$ without losing its minimality with respect to convex order. In a special case, when $F_1, \cdots, F_n$ are on $\mathbb{R}^+$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - F_i(0)) \leq 1$, the convex lower bound is obtained by the mutually exclusive scenario:

$$X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^* \leq_{cx} X_1 + \cdots + X_n$$

for any $(X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$, where $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$ and $P(X_i^* > 0, X_j^* > 0) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$; see Dhaene and Denuit (1999, Theorem 10). When the marginals $F_1, F_2, \cdots, F_n$ are two-point distributions, the result can be found in Hu and Wang (1999). Mutual exclusivity can be considered as the strongest negative dependence structure in a multivariate setting. It was first studied in Dhaene and Denuit (1999), and recently revisited, generalized and further characterized in Cheung and Lo (2014).

Definition 1.1. *(Cheung and Lo (2014)) Let* $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ *be random variables with essential infima* $l_1, \cdots, l_n$ *and essential suprema* $u_1, \cdots, u_n$ *respectively. They are said to*

be
(i) mutually exclusive from below if $P(X_i > l_i, X_j > l_j) = 0$ *for all* $i \neq j$*;*
(ii) mutually exclusive from above if $P(X_i < u_i, X_j < u_j) = 0$ *for all* $i \neq j$*.*

The following theorem, due to Cheung and Lo (2014), concerning mutually exclusive random variables and the minimal lower bound in convex order.

Theorem 1.2. *(Cheung and Lo (2014)) Let* $\mathbf{X}^* = (X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ *be a fixed random vector in* $\mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$ *(*$n \geq 3$*) which satisfies* $\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - F_i(l_i)) \leq 1$ *or* $\sum_{i=1}^n F_i(u_i-) \leq 1$*. Then* $\mathbf{X}^*$ *is mutually exclusive if and only if*

$$X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^* \leq_{cx} X_1 + \cdots + X_n$$

for all $(X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$*.*

In this short note, we give a new proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. The proof is given in the next two sections.

2 A new proof of Theorem 1.1

To prove Theorem 1.1, we need two useful lemmas. Here are some notations. Let F_X be the cumulative distribution function of random variable X and the decumulative distribution function is denoted by $\bar{F}_X$, i.e. $\bar{F}_X(x) = 1 - F_X(x) = P(X > x)$. A distortion function is defined as a non-decreasing function $g : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$ such that $g(0) = 0$ and $g(1) = 1$. The distortion risk measure associated with distortion function g is denoted by $\rho_g[\cdot]$ and is defined by

$$\rho_g[X] = \int_0^{+\infty} g(\bar{F}_X(x))dx + \int_{-\infty}^0 [g(\bar{F}_X(x)) - 1]dx,$$

for any random variable X, provided at least one of the two integrals above is finite. If X is a non-negative random variable, then ρ_g reduces to

$$\rho_g[X] = \int_0^{+\infty} g(\bar{F}_X(x))dx.$$

Obviously, a concave distortion function is continuous on $(0, 1]$ and can only jump at 0. In view of Dhaene et al. (2012, Theorem 6) we know that for any concave distortion

function g, one can rewrite $\rho_g[X]$ as

$$\rho_g[X] = \int_{[0,1]} VaR_{1-q}[X]dg(q),$$

where $VaR_p[X] = \inf\{x|F_X(x) \geq p\}$.

The following theorem shows that stop-loss order can be characterized in terms of ordered concave distortion risk measures; see Dhaene et al. (2000) and Dhaene et al. (2006). Here we provide a short proof.

Lemma 2.1. *For any random pair (X, Y) we have that $X \leq_{sl} Y$ if and only if their respective concave distortion risk measures are ordered: $X \leq_{sl} Y \Leftrightarrow \rho_g[X] \leq \rho_g[Y]$ for all concave distortion functions g. In particular, if E[X]=E[Y], then $X \leq_{cx} Y \Leftrightarrow \rho_g[X] \leq \rho_g[Y]$ for all concave distortion functions g.*

Proof For any concave distortion function g, ρ_g can be written as

$$\rho_g[X] = \int_0^1 TVaR_p[X]d\mu(p),$$

where μ is a probability measure and $TVaR_p$ is the tail value-at -risk at level p:

$$TVaR_p[X] = \frac{1}{1-p}\int_p^1 VaR_w[X]dw,$$

which is a distortion risk measure corresponding to the concave distortion function

$$g(x) = \min\left\{\frac{x}{1-p}, 1\right\}, 0 < p < 1.$$

The result follows as $X \leq_{sl} Y \Leftrightarrow TVaR_p[X] \leq TVaR_p[Y]$ for all $p \in (0, 1)$ (see Theorem 3.2 in Dhaene et al. (2006)).

The following subadditivity theorem can be found in Dhaene et al. (2000), the bivariate case can be found in Denneberg (1994), see also Wang and Dhaene (1998).

Lemma 2.2. *For any concave distortion function g and $(X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$, we have*

$$\rho_g[X_1 + \cdots + X_n] \leq \rho_g[X_1] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n].$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1 First we assume $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$ is comonotonic. For any concave distortion function g and $(X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$, by Lemma 2.2 we have

$$\rho_g[X_1 + \cdots + X_n] \leq \rho_g[X_1] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n]. \tag{2.1}$$

Comonotonicity of $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$ implies that (cf. Dhaene et al. (2006))

$$\rho_g[X_1] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n] = \rho_g[X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*]. \tag{2.2}$$

Therefore, combining (2.1) with (2.2) one has

$$\rho_g[X_1 + \cdots + X_n] \leq \rho_g[X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*],$$

and the desired result follows from Lemma 2.1.

To prove the other implication, we assume that $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$ and

$$X_1 + \cdots + X_n \leq_{cx} X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^* \text{ for all } (X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n).$$

From Lemma 2.1 we have that

$$\rho_g[X_1 + \cdots + X_n] \leq \rho_g[X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*],$$

for all concave distortion functions g. In particular,

$$\rho_g[X_1^c + \cdots + X_n^c] \leq \rho_g[X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*], \tag{2.3}$$

where $(X_1^c, \cdots, X_n^c)$ is the comonotonic counterpart of $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.2 we get

$$\rho_g[X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*] \leq \rho_g[X_1^*] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n^*]. \tag{2.4}$$

If $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ is not comonotonic, then

$$\rho_g[X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*] \neq \rho_g[X_1^*] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n^*],$$

which, together with (2.4) leads to

$$\rho_g[X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*] < \rho_g[X_1^*] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n^*]. \tag{2.5}$$

It follows from (2.3) and (2.5) and note that

$$\rho_g[X_1^c + \cdots + X_n^c] = \rho_g[X_1^c] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n^c],$$

we have

$$\rho_g[X_1^c] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n^c] < \rho_g[X_1^*] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n^*],$$

which is obviously a contradiction since

$$\rho_g[X_1^c] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n^c] = \rho_g[X_1^*] + \cdots + \rho_g[X_n^*].$$

Thus, $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ is comonotonic. This ends the proof of Theorem 1.1.

3 A new proof of Theorem 1.2

To prove Theorem 1.2, we need two useful lemmas. Lemma 3.1 gives a necessary and sufficient condition for convex order of two rvs which was given in Proposition 3.4.3 of Denuit et al. (2005).

Lemma 3.1. *(Denuit et al. (2005, Proposition 3.4.3)) Given two rvs X and Y, then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) $X \leq_{cx} Y$.

(2) $E[v(X)] \leq E[v(Y)]$ for all convex functions v such that the expectations exist.

(3) $E[v(X)] \leq E[v(Y)]$ for all functions v with $v'' \geq 0$ such that the expectations exist.

The following lemma, due to Cheung and Lo (2013), will play a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 3.2. *(Cheung and Lo (2013, Theorem 3.1)) Let $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ be non-negative random variables and f be a convex function such that $E[f(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i)]$ exists.*

(i) We have

$$E[f(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i)] \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} E[f(X_i)] - (n-1)f(0);$$

(ii) if f is strictly convex, then

$$E[f(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i)] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} E[f(X_i)] - (n-1)f(0)$$

if and only if $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ are mutually exclusive random variables in the sense of Dhaene and Denuit (1999).

Remark 3.1. *We remark that the "if part" is still true when the function f is convex, but not necessarily strictly convex.*

Proof of Theorem 1.2. To prove Theorem 1.2, as in the proof to Lemma 3.6 in Cheung and Lo (2014), there are three cases to consider.

Case 1. $l_1 = \cdots = l_n = 0$. First we assume $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$ is mutually exclusive. For any convex function u and $(X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$, By Lemma 3.2 (i) we have

$$E[u(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i)] \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} E[u(X_i)] - (n-1)u(0). \tag{3.1}$$

Thanks to Lemma 3.2 (ii) and Remark 3.1, mutual exclusivity of $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ implies that

$$E[u(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^*)] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} E[u(X_i^*)] - (n-1)u(0). \tag{3.2}$$

Therefore, combining (3.1) with (3.2), and note that $E[u(X_1^*)] + \cdots + E[u(X_n^*)] = E[u(X_1)] + \cdots + E[u(X_n)]$, one has

$$E[u(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^*)] \leq E[u(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i)],$$

from which and Lemma 3.1, we deduce that

$$X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^* \leq_{cx} X_1 + \cdots + X_n$$

for all $(X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$.

To prove the other implication, we assume that $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$ and

$$X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^* \leq_{cx} X_1 + \cdots + X_n \text{ for all } (X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n).$$

From Lemma 3.1 we have that

$$E[u(X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*)] \leq E[u(X_1 + \cdots + X_n)]$$

for all convex functions u. In particular,

$$E[u(X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*)] \leq E[u(X_1^M + \cdots + X_n^M)] \tag{3.3}$$

where $(X_1^M, \cdots, X_n^M)$ is the mutually exclusive counterpart of $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.2 and Remark 3.1 we get

$$E[u(X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*)] \geq E[u(X_1^*)] + \cdots + E[u(X_n^*))] - (n-1)u(0), \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$E[u(X_1^M + \cdots + X_n^M)] = E[u(X_1^M)] + \cdots + E[u(X_n^M))] - (n-1)u(0), \tag{3.5}$$

If $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ is not mutually exclusive, then

$$E[u(X_1^* + \cdots + X_n^*)] \neq E[u(X_1^*)] + \cdots + E[u(X_n^*))] - (n-1)u(0). \tag{3.6}$$

Combining (3.3)-(3.5) with (3.6) we get

$$E[u(X_1^*)] + \cdots + E[u(X_n^*))] < E[u(X_1^M)] + \cdots + E[u(X_n^M))].$$

This contradicts that $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ and $(X_1^M, \cdots, X_n^M)$ having the as marginal distributions. Thus, $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ is mutually exclusive.

Case 2. $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ is mutually exclusive from below. For any $(X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$, then $Z := X_i - l_i$ are non-negative random variables, $Z^* := X_i^* - l_i$ are non-negative mutually exclusive random variables. Applying the result in Case 1 we obtain that $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ is mutually exclusive $\Leftrightarrow (X_1^* - l_1, \cdots, X_n^* - l_n)$ is mutually exclusive

$$\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i^* - l_i) \leq_{cx} \sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i - l_i) \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^* - \sum_{i=1}^{n} l_i \leq_{cx} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n} l_i$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^* \leq_{cx} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i.$$

Case 3. $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ is mutually exclusive from above. For any $(X_1, \cdots, X_n) \in \mathcal{R}(F_1, \cdots, F_n)$, applying the result in Case 2, we have $(X_1^*, \cdots, X_n^*)$ is mutually exclusive from above $\Leftrightarrow (-X_1^*, \cdots, -X_n^*)$ is mutually exclusive from below $\Leftrightarrow -\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^* \leq_{cx} -\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^* \leq_{cx} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is complete now.

Acknowledgements. The research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11171179, 11571198) and the Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China (No. 20133705110002).

References

[1] Cheung, K.C., 2008. Characterization of comonotonicity using convex order. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 43, 403-406.

[2] Cheung, K.C., 2010a. Comonotonic convex upper bound and majorization. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 47, 154-158.

[3] Cheung, K.C., 2010b. Characterizing a comonotonic random vector by the distribution of the sum of its components. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 47(2), 130-136.

[4] Cheung, K.C., Lo, A., 2013a. Characterizations of counter-monotonicity and upper comonotonicity by (tail) convex order. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 53, 334-342.

[5] Cheung, K.C., Lo, A., 2013b. General lower bounds on convex functionals of aggregate sums. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 53, 884-896.

[6] Cheung, K.C., Lo, A., 2014. Characterizing mutual exclusivity as the strongest negative multivariate dependence structure. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 55, 180-190.

[7] Deelstra, G., Dhaene, J., Vanmaele, M., 2010. An overview of comonotonicity and its applications in finance and insurance. In B. Oksendal and G. Nunno, eds, Advanced mathematical methods for finance. pp.155-179. Heidelberg, Springer.

[8] Denneberg, D., 1994. Non-additive measure and integral. Kluwer Academic Publilshers, Dordrecht.

[9] Dhaene, J., Denuit, M., 1999. The safest dependence structure among risks. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 25, 11-21.

[10] Denuit, M., Dhaene, J., Goovaerts, M., Kaas, R., 2005. Actuarial Theory for Dependent Risks: Measures, Orders and Models. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.

[11] Dhaene, J., Denuit, M., Goovaerts, M.J., Kaas, R., Vyncke, D., 2002a. The concept of comonotonicity in actuarial science and finance: Theory. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 31 (1), 3-33.

[12] Dhaene, J., Denuit, M., Goovaerts, M.J., Kaas, R., Vyncke, D., 2002b. The concept of comonotonicity in actuarial science and finance: Applications. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 31(2), 133-161.

[13] Dhaene, J., Goovaerts, M.J., 1996. Dependency of risks and stop-loss order. ASTIN Bulletin 26, 201-212.

[14] Dhaene, J., Goovaerts, M.J., 1997. On the dependency of risks in the individual life model. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 19, 243-253.

[15] Dhaene, J., Wang, S., Young, V., Goovaerts, M., 2000. Comonotonicity and maximal stop-loss premiums. Bulletin of the Swiss Association of Actuaries 2, 99-113.

[16] Dhaene, J., Kukush, A., Linders, D., Tang, Q., 2012. Remarks on quantiles and distortion risk measures. European Actuarial Journal 2 (2), 319-328.

[17] Dhaene, J., Vanduffel, S., Tang, Q., Goovaerts, M., Kaas, R., Vyncke, D., 2006. Risk measures and comonotonicity: a review. Stochastic Models 22, 573-606.

[18] Goovaerts M.J., Dhaene J., 1999. Supermodular ordering and stochastic annuitie. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 24, 281-290.

[19] Hu, T.Z., Wang, Z.Q., 1999. On the dependence of risks and the stop-loss premiums. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 24, 323-332.

[20] Kaas, R., Dhaene, J., Vyncke, D., Goovaerts, M., Denuit, M., 2002. A simple geometric proof that comonotonic risks have the convex-largest sum. ASTIN Bulletin 32(1), 71-80.

[21] Mao, T.T., Hu, T.Z., 2011. A new proof of Cheung's characterization of comonotonicity. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 48(2), 214-216.

[22] Müller, A., 1997. Stop-loss order for portfolios of dependent risks. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 21, 219-223.

[23] Schmeidler, D., 1986. Integral representation without additivity. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 97, 255-261.

[24] Shaked, M., Shanthikumar, J.G., 2007. Stochastic Orders. Springer, New York.

[25] Wang, S., Dhaene, J., 1998. Comonotonicity, correlation order and premium principles. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics 22, 235-242.

[26] Yaari, M. E., 1987. The dual theory of choice under risk. Econometrica 55, 95-115.